

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

CARL BARRETT,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 20-CV-508

TREVOR CHAPMAN, *et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER

On October 1, 2021, the court granted summary judgment in favor of the defendants. (ECF No. 50.) The court found that, as a matter of law, the defendants were not deliberately indifferent to *pro se* plaintiff Carl Barrett's flu-like symptoms and that Barrett did not demonstrate that he suffered a recoverable harm.

On October 19, 2021, Barrett filed a motion for the court to reconsider its ruling on summary judgment. (ECF No. 53.) Barrett provides more details about the incident but does not demonstrate that he suffered a recoverable harm as a result of the defendants' actions. Instead, Barrett simply takes issue with the way the motion for summary judgment was evaluated and considered. That is not a basis for granting his motion. *See Oto v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 244 F.3d 601, 606 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding that a motion that "merely took umbrage with the court's ruling and

rehashed arguments” was properly rejected by the district court). The court denies Barrett’s motion for reconsideration.

On January 21, 2022, Barrett filed a motion for an injunction, claiming that the defendants are retaliating against him. (ECF No. 56.) Because Barrett’s case is closed and judgment has been entered, he needs to file his retaliation claims as a new case. The court denies his motion for an injunction.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDRED that Barrett’s motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 53) is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Barrett’s motion for an injunction (ECF No. 56) is **DENIED**.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 24th day of January, 2022.

BY THE COURT

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "William E. Duffin". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

WILLIAM E. DUFFIN
United States Magistrate Judge